



In the United States Patent Office

Application Serial No.:

Filing Date:

Title:

Inventor:

Art Unit:

Examiner:

My File:

2601 97
12-2-93
0211
07/965,427

October 23, 1992

Controller

Salcudean, T.

2609

Chang, V.

UBC53US

#6 B.N.E.
Rose
12-14-93

DEC 13 1993
UNIT 260

The Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sirs:

RESPONSE

This is in response to the Office Action of October 29, 1993. Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims of this application under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over newly cited Clark et al. in view of Cadoz et al. is respectfully requested in the light of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 18 are being prosecuted.

Before discussing the rejection, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the relative merits of this case by telephone. However, it was obvious that no agreement could be reached. Therefore, Applicant will present his arguments in writing so that they may be clearly read, understood and specifically dealt with should the Examiner still believe there is a merit in the rejection.

It is believed that it will be apparent from the following that this rejection is based on

a) misinterpretation of the references